

14

# LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE IN THE FORTY-EIGHT STATES

---

By  
ADDISON E. SHELDON  
and  
MYRTLE KEEGAN

---

NEBRASKA LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

BULLETIN NO. 3

---

LINCOLN  
JANUARY 1, 1914



# LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE IN THE FORTY-EIGHT STATES

---

By  
ADDISON E. SHELDON  
and  
MYRTLE KEEGAN

---

NEBRASKA LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

BULLETIN NO. 3

---

LINCOLN  
JANUARY 1, 1914





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

	Page
Prefatory .....	5
Introduction .....	7
Bills .....	7
Bill drafting .....	8
Causes of increase .....	8
Origin of .....	9
Tabular statement of bills and state aid in bill drafting.....	10, 11
Summary of bills and bill drafting .....	12
Amendatory .....	13, 14
Method of enrolling and engrossing .....	15
Size of .....	15
Legislative sessions .....	13
Tabular statement of length, time and limit in all the states.....	13
Legislative publications .....	15
Committees .....	16
Size and number of .....	16, 17
Dispatch of business .....	17
Votes in committees .....	17
Employees .....	18
Tabular statement of employes in each house of the last legislature in all the states .....	18
Tabular statement of method of selecting .....	19
Economy and efficiency of .....	19, 20
Finance and budget .....	20
The budget theory of state finance .....	20-22
Summary of method of making appropriation bills in all the states..	20-25
Cost of legislative sessions .....	25
Tabular statement of cost of legislative sessions in all the states...	26-28




## PREFATORY

---

It is the plan of the Nebraska Legislative Reference Bureau to issue from time to time bulletins upon important public matters. These bulletins will aim to briefly condense all the valuable known facts, so organized as to be easily grasped in a brief space of time by the average citizen. Bulletin No. 3 has been undertaken in aid of a resolution adopted by the last session of the Nebraska legislature calling for a committee of three from the senate and three from the house to investigate legislative procedure in the different states and report thereon to the governor and the next session of the Nebraska legislature. Under this resolution the house appointed J. N. Norton, O. A. Corbin and H. C. Palmer as members; the senate appointed as members Walter Kiechel, J. M. Talcott and B. K. Bushee. This committee is now at work. Its report and recommendations will appear later. Meanwhile this bulletin is issued as a contribution to the general public information on an important subject. It is, I believe, the first comprehensive compilation in this field made in the United States.

The principal labor of securing, organizing and editing the material in this bulletin has been done by Miss Myrtle Keegan.

ADDISON E. SHELDON,  
Director.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries



# LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE IN THE FORTY-EIGHT STATES

## INTRODUCTION.

There is little doubt that a new form of government will eventually be inaugurated in the various states of the Union. Much is now being said on the subject. All around is evidence of dissatisfaction with present-day legislative methods and results. Innumerable are the advocated reforms. Governor O'Neal of Alabama says there is too much legislation; that in many states a session of the legislature is looked upon in the nature of a public calamity. Governor Hodges of Kansas declares the legislature of his own state is inefficient and proposes to reduce the body to ten or fifteen men (one from each congressional district in the state); these men to give their time continuously—or so much thereof as necessary—to the subject of legislation. Everywhere there is demand for more efficient system in legislation and administration.

This bulletin confines itself to legislatures as they now actually exist; its purpose is to set forth the various methods now used in the different states, so that all may profit by the examples and experiences of others. Many legislatures still work under the routine established twenty, fifty or more years ago, despite all the improvements made possible by modern thought and better business methods. Such condition hampers the efficiency of any society. It has well been said: "You cannot make a government more efficient, more business-like, more economical, than the machinery which operates it." Men in the public service are less at fault than the methods under which they labor. It is the machinery of the legislatures which is considered in this bulletin. This machinery falls naturally under four heads, viz.:

- Bills,
- Committees,
- Employes,
- Finance and Budget,

which are hereinafter considered.

The material presented is the result of six months' correspondence with public officials and publicists in each of the forty-eight states. careful study and compilation of the results and verification of the same from public documents.

## I. BILLS.

A bill is the beginning of a law. Brevity, clearness, logical sequence and simplicity should mark its construction. Order, deliberation, publicity and efficiency should mark the process of its consideration and passage.

In the beginnings of legislation by the states of the American union bills were usually drawn by members themselves. The lawyer members of a legislature, or some legislative clerk, generally drafted the bills for members who had no legal training. A little later, following the growth of corporations and business interests, the bills desired by these interests were drafted by their retained regular attorneys. In Nebraska twenty years ago a large part of the bill drafting was done during the session by various lobbyists and legislative agents as a free favor to members whose acquaintance and good will they desired.

In order to secure greater care and fidelity to the public interest in the construction of bills, a number of states have provided trained assistants to their legislatures whose duty is to put in clear, legal form the ideas members wish

enacted into statute. About twenty states now have such bill drafting departments. A committee of the American Bar Association reported at the last meeting of the association held at Montreal, September 1, 1913, the following resolution, which was adopted, representing the lawyer's view of reference and bill drafting departments:

*"Resolved, That, in the opinion of the association, an official legislative drafting and reference service, when properly organized and directed, forms an efficient agency tending to prevent the enactment of unconstitutional, obscure and otherwise defective statutes and to secure the utmost brevity and simplicity consistent with accuracy in the language of statutes and we hereby recommend the establishment and generous support of such service at Washington and in those states not now having such service."*

#### BILL DRAFTING.

Legislative Reference Bureaus, or Legislative Reference Libraries in the following states, assist in drafting bills—drafting any number up to 75 per cent of the total number, which is the record of the Pennsylvania Reference Bureau for the last session: California (Legislative Council Bureau), Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin (bill drafting commission). In some states the Attorney General or State Librarian assists in the work of drafting bills, *e. g.*, in Kansas, Oregon, and New Jersey (when the state has an interest). New York has a bill drafting commission with a force of twenty persons. Wisconsin has a bill drafting department of her legislative reference library and a joint committee on revision to which is committed all bills for consideration of form. This committee is required to report out all bills by the close of the sixth week.

The tabular statement on pages 10 and 11 shows the number of bills introduced and the status of state aid in bill drafting in the several states.

#### NUMBER OF BILLS.

With only a few exceptions, there is an increase session by session in the number of bills introduced in the various legislatures. Two-thirds of the forty-eight states report an increase in a greater or lesser degree. For example, Massachusetts has doubled the number since 1905, while Ohio has had only a slight increase. In many cases, the additional number of bills presented to each successive legislature is due to new problems arising from actual growth of the state. A cause less worthy is the desire of members to identify themselves with popular legislation regardless of the social or economic effect of their action, as a result of which popular measures are introduced in practically the same form by many different members. Such bills are often absolute duplicates except for the name of the introducer.\* Another form of duplication may be found in the simultaneous appearance of a bill in senate and house, the hope being that should the bill fail in one house, it might still meet success through the other branch. Members frequently introduce bills to cancel obligations or in response to requests from their constituents, without regard to the merits of a bill or its previous introduction by another member.

A more general explanation of this growing increase in the number of bills introduced into legislatures is the seeming desire to regulate all human activity by law—a law for each conceivable idea of merit.

In the 1913 session of the Nebraska legislature there were 1356 bills introduced in the two houses. With 60 days allowed for the session and an average day of 6 hours there was 16 minutes for each bill, which in case the bill became a law, would include in each house, three readings, committee of the whole discussion and at least one roll call. The impossibility of disposing of one bill every 16 minutes suggests that a majority of the bills cannot

---

\* In the Nebraska legislative session of 1913, 112 bills were introduced in duplicate and some even in triplicate.



and do not receive the consideration of either body. Better committee work is needed to weed out bills.

Some states effect economy by printing only bills favorably reported from committees. In Minnesota, for example, a house bill unfavorably reported from committee can be printed only by a majority vote of the house; a senate bill unfavorably reported from committee can be printed only after suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote by the senate. Mississippi prints bills only when the legislature so orders. Economy of time is brought about in some states by steering or sifting committees appointed at the beginning of the session, thus effecting an early consideration of the more important bills and an elimination of the unimportant bills which would otherwise crowd the files until acted upon by a similar committee appointed late in the session.

#### THE ORIGIN OF BILLS.

On April 10, 1913, six days before the final adjournment of the Nebraska legislature, the Legislative Reference Bureau addressed a letter to each member of the Nebraska house and senate, giving the calendar number of each bill introduced by that member and asking him to go over the list while the matter was still fresh in mind and answer certain questions designed to disclose the source of bills introduced by the member. Answers were received from fifty-eight members out of one hundred in the house and covered 577 of the 889 bills introduced. Fourteen replies were received from thirty-three members in the senate and covered 164 of the 457 bills introduced there. The table which follows gives a compilation of all these answers and the questions asked the members:

	House	Senate
(1) How many bills were introduced as the result of your own individual initiative and study of the subject?.....	235	53
(2) How many bills were introduced at the special request of some constituent or constituents in your district?.....	175	59
(3) How many were introduced at the request of persons not resident in your own district, but resident of the state?...	78	29
(4) How many of these bills were introduced at the request of some society, association or other organization in the state?	53	21
(5) How many were introduced at the instance and request of other individuals and organizations than those comprised in the preceding four questions?.....	36	2
Total .....	577	164

NUMBER OF BILLS AND STATE AID IN BILL DRAFTING.

STATE	1913		1912		1911		1910		1909		Does the state furnish a department for bill drafting? If so, what?	What proportion of bills are charged for this service?
	Senate	Assembly or House Total	Senate	Assembly or House Total	Senate	Assembly or House Total	Senate	Assembly or House Total	Senate	Assembly or House Total		
Alabama.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	487	824 1,311	.....	.....	.....	.....	No.....	.....
Arizona, Senate of	311	218 529	244	253 497	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	No.....	.....
Arkansas.....	308	435 743	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	No.....	.....
California.....	1,783	2,139 3,922	.....	.....	1,290	1,588 2,878	.....	.....	1,254	1,451 2,705	Yes. Legislative Council Bureau *	No chg.
Colorado.....	545	741 1,286	.....	.....	562	560 1,122	.....	.....	457	620 1,077	No.....	.....
Connecticut.....	551	1,200 1,751	.....	.....	392	930 1,322	.....	.....	286	815 1,101	Legist v. Ref. Dept.	No chg.
Delaware.....	275	350 625	.....	.....	250	300 550	.....	.....	225	275 500	No.....	.....
Florida.....	568	924 1,492	.....	.....	524	746 1,270	.....	.....	519	774 1,293	No.....	.....
Georgia †.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	No.....	.....
Idaho.....	214	421 635	.....	.....	176	465 641	.....	.....	528	740 1,268	Yes. Legislative Reference Bureau *	No chg.
Illinois.....	695	913 1,608	.....	.....	500	677 1,177	.....	.....	449	634 1,083	Yes. Bureau of Legislative Information.	No chg.
Indiana.....	556	773 1,329	.....	.....	455	656 1,111	.....	.....	434	549 983	Yes. Attorney General and State Library.....	No chg.
Iowa.....	564	700 1,264	.....	.....	492	613 1,105	.....	.....	670	1,003 1,673	Yes. Bureau of Legislative Information.	No chg.
Kansas.....	808	963 1,773	.....	.....	687	1,067 1,754	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kentucky.....	.....	.....	363	551 914	.....	.....	348	541 889	.....	.....	No.....	No chg.
Louisiana.....	.....	.....	500	501 1,001	.....	.....	457	457 914	.....	.....	No.....	.....
Maine †.....	671	725 1,396	.....	.....	263	767 1,030	.....	.....	503	809 1,312	No.....	.....
Maryland.....	.....	.....	606	798 1,404	.....	.....	555	690 1,245	.....	.....	No.....	.....
Massachusetts...	590	2,577 3,167	548	2,371 2,919	.....	.....	.....	.....	616	2,201 2,817	Yes. Legislative Reference Bureau	No chg.
Michigan.....	553	708 1,261	.....	.....	448	627 1,075	.....	.....	340	544 884	Yes. Legislative Reference Bureau	No chg.
Minnesota.....	978	1,248 2,226	.....	.....	912	1,159 2,071	.....	.....	915	1,193 2,108	No.....	.....
Mississippi.....	.....	.....	502	812 1,314	.....	.....	590	592 1,182	.....	.....	No.....	.....
Missouri.....	598	972 1,570	.....	.....	479	1,249 1,728	.....	.....	802	1,168 1,970	No.....	.....
Montana.....	182	428 610	.....	.....	201	456 657	.....	.....	132	404 536	No.....	.....
Nebraska.....	457	889 1,346	.....	.....	396	703 1,099	.....	.....	408	578 986	Yes. Legislative Reference Bureau	Hitherto no chg. In future \$5.00
Nevada.....	184	296 480	.....	.....	289	289 578	.....	.....	147	246 393	No.....	.....
New Hampshire..	100	700 800	.....	.....	80	650 730	.....	.....	50	600 650	No.....	.....
New Jersey.....	378	862 1,240	353	682 1,035	364	641 1,005	340	551 891	388	459 847	Yes. Attorney General when administration is interested.	No chg.





INCREASE IN NUMBER OF BILLS INTRODUCED AT THE LAST SESSION  
OVER THE NUMBER INTRODUCED IN THE PRECEDING  
SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE IN EACH STATE.

(a) In states which have furnished bill drafting assistance:

State	Percentage of increase	Actual number of increase
Connecticut .....	32	429
Indiana .....	19	218
Kansas .....	1	19
Michigan .....	17	186
Nebraska .....	22	247
New Jersey .....	19	205
New York .....	40	1222
North Dakota .....	8	68
Ohio .....	5	53
Pennsylvania .....	19	425
Rhode Island .....	14	88
South Dakota .....	22	163
Vermont .....	Decrease	27 decrease
Wisconsin .....	3	51

(b) States which have not hitherto furnished bill drafting assistance:

State	Percentage of increase	Actual number of increase
Alabama .....	—	—
Arizona (Senate) .....	6	32
Arkansas .....	Decrease	373 decrease
California .....	36	1044
Colorado .....	14	164
Delaware .....	13	75
Florida .....	17	222
Georgia .....	—	—
Idaho .....	Decrease	7 decrease
Illinois .....	36	431
Iowa .....	14	159
Kentucky .....	2	25
Louisiana .....	9	87
Maine .....	35	366
Maryland .....	12	159
Massachusetts .....	8	248
Minnesota .....	7	155
Mississippi .....	11	132
Missouri .....	Decrease	153 decrease
Montana .....	Decrease	47 decrease
Nevada .....	Decrease	98 decrease
New Hampshire .....	9	70
New Mexico .....	5	24
North Carolina .....	3	138
Oklahoma .....	No change	—
Oregon .....	34	246
South Carolina .....	Decrease	64 decrease
Tennessee .....	15	360
Texas .....	42	416
Utah .....	Decrease	41 decrease
Virginia .....	—	—
Washington .....	36	318
West Virginia .....	7	43
Wyoming .....	22	71

## LEGISLATURES.

State	Next regular session begins	Ann. or Bien.	Limit of session	State	Next regular session begins	Ann. or Bien.	Limit of session
Alabama.....	Jan., 1915	Quad.	50 days	Nebraska.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Arizona.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days	Nevada.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Arkansas.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days	New Hampshire	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None
California.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None	New Jersey.....	Jan., 1914	Ann.	None
Colorado.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None	New Mexico.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Connecticut.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None	New York.....	Jan., 1914	Ann.	None
Delaware.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days	North Carolina.	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Florida.....	Apr., 1915	Bien.	60 days	North Dakota..	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Georgia.....	June, 1914	Ann.	50 days	Ohio.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None
Idaho.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days	Oklahoma.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Illinois.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None	Oregon.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	40 days
Indiana.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days	Pennsylvania...	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None
Iowa.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None	Rhode Island...	Jan., 1914	Ann.	60 days
Kansas.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	90 days	South Carolina.	Jan., 1914	Ann.	None
Kentucky.....	Jan., 1914	Bien.	60 days	South Dakota...	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Louisiana.....	May, 1914	Bien.	60 days	Tennessee.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	75 days
Maine.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None	Texas.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Maryland.....	Jan., 1914	Bien.	90 days	Utah.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Massachusetts...	Jan., 1914	Ann.	None	Vermont.....	Oct., 1914	Bien.	None
Michigan.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None	Virginia.....	Jan., 1914	Bien.	60 days
Minnesota.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	90 days	Washington.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days
Mississippi.....	Jan., 1914	Bien.	None	West Virginia...	Jan., 1915	Bien.	45 days
Missouri.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	70 days	Wisconsin.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	None
Montana.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	60 days	Wyoming.....	Jan., 1915	Bien.	40 days

## SUMMARY.

Quadrennial sessions: Alabama.

Annual sessions: Georgia, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina.

Biennial sessions (meeting even numbered years) Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Vermont, Virginia.

All other states meet biennially, odd numbered years.

## AMENDATORY BILLS.

There is a very great advantage in having amendatory bills so printed as to distinguish on their face between new matter proposed for the statutes, old matter to remain in the revised law, and old matter to be omitted. In many states the legislator is obliged to compare the new bill, word by word and line by line, with the old statute in order to know what changes are proposed and how to vote upon the measure. Hundreds of people in and out of the legislature interested in pending legislation are unable to understand the purpose of an amendatory bill without carefully comparing it with the statute. This is difficult to do, causes many delays upon the floor of the legislature and prevents citizens who have not immediate access to the compiled statutes from knowing the nature of a bill.

When these different features of an amendatory bill are clearly shown in the printed bill one can determine almost at a glance the merits of a bill, for he has before him the new matter proposed as well as that which has hitherto been the law and is to be omitted under the proposed act. There are many different ways of making this distinction. For example, Wisconsin prints new matter in italics; old matter retained, in ordinary type; and old matter to be omitted appears with a horizontal black line across its face. Example of Wisconsin bill follows:



The people of the State of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. Sections 1567 and 1569 of the statutes are amended to read:  
 2 Section 1567. No person shall sell, barter, give or in any manner dispose  
 3 of an intoxicating liquors of any kind to any Indian or to any mixed-blood  
 4 Indian except civilized persons of Indian descent, not members of any  
 5 tribe; within this state, who is not a ward of the government of the United  
 6 States; and every person so offending shall for each offense be punished  
 7 by a fine not exceeding less than one hundred dollars nor over five hundred  
 8 dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding less than three  
 9 months nor exceeding six months, or both.

Other methods of making amendatory bills are shown in table which follows.

DO THE PRINTED AMENDATORY BILLS SPECIFICALLY SHOW ON  
 THEIR FACE THE NEW MATTER WHICH IT IS PROPOSED TO  
 PLACE IN THE STATUTE AND ALSO OLD MATTER  
 WHICH IT IS PROPOSED TO OMIT AND HOW?

STATE	ACTION	STATE	ACTION
Alabama.....		Montana.....	No.
Senate of Arizona..	Yes, Wisconsin method used	Nebraska.....	No.
Arkansas.....	No.	Nevada.....	No.
California.....	No.	New Hampshire...	Yes.
Colorado.....	Yes.	New Jersey.....	New matter underscored. Old matter to be omitted in brackets.
Connecticut.....	Enough of statute cited to show effect of amendment.	New Mexico.....	No.
Delaware.....	No. Very few bills printed.	New York.....	New matter in italics. Old matter to be omitted in brackets.
Florida.....	No. Very few bills printed.	North Carolina....	No.
Georgia.....	They show this when ordered printed.	North Dakota....	No.
Idaho.....	House bills, yes; Senate bills, no.	Ohio.....	New matter indicated by italics. Places where old matter is omitted marked by stars.
Illinois.....	Entire amended section shown, new matter usually in italics.	Oklahoma.....	No.
Indiana.....	No. Only amendments made in either house shown.	Oregon.....	No.
Iowa.....	No.	Pennsylvania.....	New matter in different type.
Kansas.....	No.	Rhode Island....	No.
Kentucky.....	No.	South Carolina....	No.
Louisiana.....	Both are shown.	South Dakota....	No.
Maine.....	Not required, but changes are described in phrases such as "strike out" and "insert."	Tennessee.....	No.
Maryland.....	No.	Texas.....	Printed bills show new but not old matter.
Massachusetts.....	Both are shown.	Utah.....	New matter italicized. Omissions indicated by a star.
Michigan.....	New matter is enclosed in brackets. Omission of old matter shown by asterisks.	Vermont.....	No.
Minnesota.....	When printed, new matter in italics; old matter to be omitted in parenthesis and printed in caps.	Virginia.....	Changes in statutes are in italics. Parts to be omitted not printed.
Mississippi.....	No. Bills rarely printed.	Washington.....	Yes. New matter underscored.
Missouri.....	Changes are indicated as in Maine.	West Virginia.....	No.
		Wisconsin.....	New matter in italics. Old matter to be omitted appears with horizontal black line across face.
		Wyoming.....	No.

## METHOD OF ENGROSSING AND ENROLLING BILLS.

Pen and ink, long hand	Typewritten	Engrossed— Typewriter Enrolled— Long hand	Engrossed— Long hand Enrolled— Typewriter	Printed
Arkansas Georgia Illinois (1870)* Indiana Louisiana Maryland (since 1st legislature) Missouri (since statehood) Nebraska (since statehood) †Nevada New Hampshire Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee (since statehood) Texas (Senate) Vermont †Virginia (since statehood)	Arizona (Senate) (1912) Colorado (1899) De aware (1913) Massachusetts (1912) Minnesota †Mississippi New Mexico (1893) North Carolina No. Dakota (1913) Oregon So. Dakota (1909) Texas (House) Utah (1907) Washington W. Virginia (1903) Wyoming (1909)	Florida (Many years) Kentucky Montana Kansas (1898) Enrolled bill printed Oklahoma	Idaho (1890) Iowa (1904)	California Connecticut (Engrossed bill) Maine (1873) Michigan (1893) New Jersey (1898) New York †Ohio (1901) †Pennsylvania (1901) Wisconsin (Engrossed by typewriter; enrolled by printing)

\* Matter in parenthesis indicates the year in which the present system was inaugurated, or the number of years it has been in use.

† Bills not actually engrossed. In some states the printed bill and in other states a copy of the original bill is "considered engrossed" by motion and assent of the house.

## SIZE OF BILLS.

The prevailing size is still the clumsy folio similar to the Nebraska bills, 8½x14 inches.

California, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maine and Missouri, Connecticut, West Virginia, and Rhode Island have adopted the much handier and probably more economical size of 6x9 or 9½ inches.

Illinois uses bills 8x12 inches, New York 10½x7½ inches, Michigan 10½x8 inches, the Dakotas 7x10½ inches, and Wisconsin 8x11 inches.

Any of these sizes seems preferable to the old style folio.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

Printed daily journals are used in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana (House), New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin and possibly one or two other states.\* This gives members the use of them a day or two after date and corrections, if any are necessary, can be made while events are still fresh in mind. In addition to this advantage, when the session closes, the journals are already in print, requiring only the preliminary matter and the indexes to complete them for binding. With a trained indexer at work during the latter part of the legislative sessions the index copy would be ready almost as soon as the last day's

\* Most of the other states, Nebraska included, use a manuscript (or typewritten) daily journal whose reading is customarily dispensed with. Serious errors sometimes occur in journals kept in this manner, no adequate opportunity for correction being offered. It is the custom in these states to make a considerable appropriation for preparing the journal for publication after adjournment.



journal, thereby saving the state both delay and additional expense for preparing the journal.

Connecticut publishes a daily calendar of orders of the day for each house, and a daily bulletin containing announcements of committee meetings and notices of various kinds pertaining to the work of the legislature.

California, Illinois, Massachusetts and Wisconsin publish in some cases daily, in others weekly, bulletins giving the history of each bill to date. These documents are usually indexed by subjects though Wisconsin publishes separately a subject index to bills.

Massachusetts also publishes separately as legislative documents the various messages, reports and other matters transmitted to it by the governor, and the state officers, boards and investigating committees. Various other states make provision for printing as legislative documents matter that should be in printed form in the hands of legislators.

## II. COMMITTEES.

From Albany (N. Y.) Press-Knicker, July 29, 1913.

In telling of the Stilwell bribery case, Governor Sulzer says: "The crooked work in legislatures is all, or nearly all, done in committees. People who take an intelligent interest in public affairs think they have made a great step when they have the public watching the legislature. They have, but a greater step will have been made when they have the public keeping the spot light on legislative committees and particularly the chairman. For immediately behind the chairman of the committee will be found the Big Boss."

"Greatest power and control over legislation is placed in committees."—Page 14, Report of Voters' Legislative Association of New York.

Senator John P. T. Mathias of Maryland says he considers greatest evil due to great powers of committees, especially chairmen.

"It is our committee system and the method of getting bills out from committees and before the house which needs attention. If the committees were required to hold public hearings on their bills and announcements of such public hearings were sent over the state and they were also required to report to their houses with recommendations on each bill, the matter of committee work would be very much better."—S. Gale Lowrie, Ohio Legislative Reference Bureau.

In Nebraska, the legislative committees are too large or too many, preventing full attendance, when important measures are considered, and careful committee work. The house and senate committees do not meet together and days of delay in the legislative business arise from threshing over the same straw in the committees of both houses. Committees meet at night when the members are weary from the day's session, instead of in the forenoon as is the practice in some states. The work of the sifting committee is unsatisfactory and there is no definite program adopted early in the session. Resolutions, many of them unimportant and irrelevant, block business for days at a time. The rules respecting committees and general procedure need further revision.—Resolution of Nebraska Legislature, 1913.

This resolution bespeaks the general condition of committee work in the various legislatures. Less than one-fourth of the legislatures in the United States report small committees. In Pennsylvania the house committees consist of 25 to 40 members; in Minnesota the largest committees have 27 members; in North Dakota the largest number on a committee is 17. These examples are typical of the majority of states. When committees are so large, each member must serve on several. In every state, so far as it has been possible to ascertain, members are placed upon several committees—though usually upon only one or possibly two important committees, the others being of lesser importance. In North Carolina, members serve on a half dozen or more committees; in the senate of South Dakota, on seven or more committees and in Colorado on three to five committees.



With large committees and one member serving on several, it is almost impossible to secure full attendance and prompt action. Especially is this true in states where meetings are held at irregular and ill planned hours. No work of the legislature is more important than the work of committees, yet in most of the states there is no definite time set, no allowance made for such work. Arizona sets definite hours and frequently takes recess for committee work. In Rhode Island, the house and senate do not convene until 12 M., thus leaving the morning hours for committee work. Night committee meetings in Massachusetts are rare. Regular meetings in Michigan are in the daytime. But these and a few other states are the exceptions and most of the committee work is done under difficult and trying conditions. Instead of a legislative plan which makes it almost impossible for a member to do efficient committee work, the routine should be that most conducive to regular attendance and intelligent action,—morning or at least daytime hours, committees of only moderate size, and such a grouping of committees that, under normal stress, a member could attend all his committee meetings. California, for example, has such a grouping of committees that there is no conflict for a member serving on several committees.

#### DISPATCH OF BUSINESS.

The Wisconsin legislature requires that all business referred to a committee be taken up within two weeks. The Colorado rules provide for compulsory reports from committees. The Minnesota senate requires all bills other than certain specified classes to be reported out from standing committees within twenty-five days from the time of reference. In the Pennsylvania House, when a bill has been ten days in the hands of a committee after having been referred to it, vote of sixty members is sufficient to discharge the committee from further consideration of the same.

Business could be greatly advanced if joint committee meetings of the senate and house were held on certain bills. One hearing would then serve where two would otherwise be necessary. Action of the two committee branches could be independent even though the hearings were had at one time. It is often necessary to spend hours listening to people who wish to appear in behalf of or in opposition to a certain bill. Joint committee meetings would produce the same results now secured and the labor would be lightened for all. There are joint committees for consideration of appropriation bills in Connecticut and New Jersey; for revenue bills in Connecticut, Idaho and Massachusetts; and in Maine, Wisconsin and Wyoming there are joint committees on finance.

#### VOTES IN COMMITTEES.

When roll calls are not taken in standing committees or in committee of the whole, a bill may be quietly disposed of without ever so much as one recorded vote upon it. Every man in the legislature could claim to have supported the bill and nothing to the contrary could be shown against any individual. Roll calls in committees, however, compel a member to go on record and for this reason he is just as careful of his action in a committee room or in committee of the whole as he would be in regular session. Yet in spite of this great check of the public upon its representatives, a majority of the legislatures do not require a record of committee votes.

## III. EMPLOYES.

## NUMBER OF MEMBERS AND EMPLOYES IN THE LAST STATE LEGISLATURES.

State	SENATE		HOUSE		Total Members	Total Employees	Approximate ratio employees to members
	Members	Employees	Members	Employees			
Alabama .....	54	10	99	16	153	26	1 to 6
Arizona, Senate	23	23	35	35	58	58	1 to 1
Arkansas .....	35	21	100	25	135	46	1 to 3
California .....	40	60	80	100	120	160	4 to 3
Colorado .....	35	41	65	47	100	88	1 to 1.1
Connecticut...	35	11	258	26	293	37	1 to 8
Delaware.....	17	11	35	10	52	21	1 to 2
Florida .....	32	16	71	17	103	33	1 to 3
Georgia.....	44	37	184	57	228	94	1 to 2
Idaho.....	24	19	61	27	85	46	1 to 2
Illinois.....	51	78	153	148	204	226	1.1 to 1
Indiana.....	50	(20 extra) About 350 for 30 days each	100	(13 extra) Included in Senate	150	About 150 full time	1 to 1
Iowa .....	50	86	108	87	158	173	1.1 to 1
Kansas .....	40	Senate and House 211	125	....	165	211	1.2 to 1
Kentucky .....	38	21	100	....	138	....	....
Louisiana.....	38	....	114	....	152	....	....
Maine .....	31	14	151	16	182	30	1 to 6
Maryland .....	27	75	101	101	128	176	3 to 2
Massachusetts.	40	26	240	40	280	66	1 to 4
Michigan.....	32	47	100	65	132	112	1 to 1.1
Minnesota.....	62	60	119	65	181	125	2 to 3
Mississippi ....	43	8	138	14	181	22	1 to 8
Missouri.....	35	165	142	150	177	315	2 to 1
Montana .....	31	62	85	108	116	170	3 to 2
Nebraska.....	33	75	100	93	133	168	3 to 2
Nevada .....	22	20	52	23	74	43	1 to 2
New Hampshire	20	9	405	21	425	30	1 to 14
New Jersey....	21	45 (regular)	60	76 (regular)	81	121	3 to 2
New Mexico...	24	15	49	17	73	32	1 to 2
New York .....	45	126	150	173	195	299	3 to 2
North Carolina	50	32	120	60	170	92	1 to 2
North Dakota.	50	40	111	67	161	107	2 to 3
Ohio.....	34	45	123	57	157	102	2 to 3
Oklahoma .....	44	39	109	84	153	123	1 to 1.2
Oregon .....	30	62	60	95	90	157	2 to 1
Pennsylvania..	50	99	207	126	257	225	1 to 1.1
Rhode Island..	38	16	100	26	138	42	1 to 3
South Carolina	43	19	124	23	167	42	1 to 4
South Dakota .	45	34	100	35	145	69	1 to 2
Tennessee .....	33	25	99	35	132	60	1 to 2
Texas.....	31	63	133	100 (and extra)	164	163	1 to 1
Utah .....	18	21	45	20	63	41	1 to 1
Vermont.....	30	9	243	44	273	53	1 to 5
Virginia .....	40	19	100	29	140	48	1 to 3
Washington ...	42	20	96	30	138	50	1 to 3
West Virginia..	30	51	86	71	116	122	1 to 1
Wisconsin .....	33	37	100	55	133	92	2 to 3
Wyoming.....	27	25	57	28	84	53	2 to 3

## SUMMARY.

There is a relatively large number of employees and small number of members in the following states: California, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Oregon.

The following states have a relatively large number of members and small number of employees: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, Washington.



## METHOD OF SELECTING EMPLOYES.

STATE	HOW APPOINTED	STATE	HOW APPOINTED
Alabama.....		Montana.....	Committee on employes.
Arizona.....	By county delegation in caucus.	Nebraska.....	Committee on employes upon recommendation of members of majority party. These employes selected for political reasons.
(Senate)			
Arkansas.....	By each house. Number regulated by law.	Nevada.. ..	Appointed by members.
California.....	Upon recommendation of various members.	New Hampshire	By the bodies.
Colorado.....	Patronage committees and members.	New Jersey....	Primarily by caucuses of controlling party; occasionally by influential member.
Connecticut...	Party caucus. Party in power distributing the patronage.		
Delaware.....	By majority of each house in caucus.	New Mexico...	By each house.
Florida.....	For political reasons.	New York.....	By Legislature.
Georgia.....	Under jurisdiction of Secretary of Senate and Clerk of House.	North Carolina	President of Senate and Speaker of House upon request of members.
Idaho.....	Vote of members.	North Dakota.	Upon recommendation of members.
Illinois.....	Presiding officer upon recommendation of members.	Ohio.....	Will be under civil service in the future.
Indiana.....	By a committee which recognizes for his share each member of majority party.	Oklahoma.....	By party caucuses in each house.
Iowa.....	Largely by caucus. Pages appointed by President; stenographers by examination; doorkeepers, etc., by joint committee.	Oregon.....	By members and committees. Some approved on floor.
		Pennsylvania..	In Senate: Party caucus. In House: Committee on committees.
Kansas.....	By committee on employes in each house.	Rhode Island..	By committee members or presiding officers.
Kentucky.....	Constitutional officers elected by house in which employed. Other employes selected by presiding officer of house.	South Carolina	Laborers appointed by chairmen of committees, Speaker of House and sergeant-at-arms.
		South Dakota.	Appointed by presiding officers.
Louisiana.....	Principally by Lieutenant Governor and Speaker of House.	Tennessee.....	Usually by Speaker.
Maine.....	By ballot in each house at beginning of session.	Texas.....	
Maryland.....	Appointed by presiding officer in each house upon recommendation of members.	Utah.....	Nomination and election.
Massachusetts.	Clerks elected by respective houses. Each clerk chooses his employes. Sergeant-at-arms who is elected chooses other employes.	Vermont.....	By sergeant-at-arms, who endeavors to have counties equally represented.
Michigan.....	Appointed by dominant party.	Virginia.....	Chief Clerk elected. He appoints assistants. Pages appointed by presiding officers. Doorkeepers, etc., elected.
Minnesota.....	Officers elected. Employes appointed by dominant party.	Washington...	By patronage committee.
Mississippi....	Clerk and secretary chosen by each house. Doorkeepers and sergeant-at-arms elected. Porters and pages appointed by presiding officer.	West Virginia..	By presiding officers and clerks.
		Wisconsin.....	Civil service examinations. Chief Clerk and sergeant-at-arms of each house appoints from list of eligibles.
Missouri.....	Some appointed, others elected. Committee on clerical force determines the number and they are apportioned to the majority party.	Wyoming.....	By the majority party. Largely for political reasons.

## ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN EMPLOYES.

Legislative employes are usually appointed through the majority party for political reasons, efficiency being a secondary consideration. By securing thoroughly capable employes the number could be reduced, in which case efficiency would mean economy. About half the states believe the number of employes could be reduced without impairing the work of the legislature. Missouri and New Jersey say a reduction of 50 per cent could be consistently made.

In only three states does efficiency seem to be the prime consideration: Wisconsin, where the legislative employes are under civil service regulation; Ohio, where civil service will be used in the future; and Iowa, where the stenographers are examined.

There is a great waste of public funds on inefficient help who draw pay for incompetent—if any—work. One of the legislative needs called for in practically all the states is the selection of more efficient employes and a smaller number.

(It has been proposed in some states that the stenographic, clerical and other work of the legislature be let by contract to responsible parties under bond the same as the legislative printing.)

#### IV. FINANCE AND BUDGET.

##### “A STATEMENT OF PROBABLE REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR A TERMINABLE PERIOD, WITH FINANCIAL PROPOSALS FOR THAT PERIOD.”

From an address on “The Social Budget,” given by Addison E. Sheldon before the Laymen’s Club of Lincoln, Nebraska, on April 20, 1909, are taken the following brief extracts:

“In the forty years from 1867 to 1907 the increase of state expenditure in Nebraska was fifty fold. In that same time population increased fourteen fold, productive horse-power eighteen fold and production of wealth about thirty fold. \* \* \* The social budget is the only plan I know to protect society from this great appropriation peril. It involves the collection of accurate information showing the amount of wealth produced within the state, the number and economic condition of the people producing this wealth, the kinds of public expenditure already in service, a brief statement of further proposed plans for public expenditure and the objects sought to be attained by them, a careful estimate of the ultimate cost of each of these projects as compared with its initial cost and some data which may assist the public mind to determine which of these plans should be taken up first and which should be postponed. Each new field of expenditure entered ought to specify the necessary taxes to meet it. Such a budget should be prepared and submitted at least a year before the meeting of the legislature which is to act upon the proposed expenditure. Its publication ought to provoke a great deal of newspaper and platform discussion and thereby the public be helped toward forming the usual rough appropriation in the public mind of what should be next on the social program.”

Since the above address was given five years ago the growth of public expenditure in the states of the Union has become more alarming. The need of a responsible authority to prepare and present plans for state expenditure and state revenue to each legislature has become more apparent. A study of Canadian government in the four western provinces made by the writer during the summer of 1913 shows conclusively some advantages in the cabinet form of government there, under which the seven heads of departments who prepare the budget and spend the money have seats in the single house of the provincial legislature and must defend on the floor their proposals for spending money and the manner in which it is spent. In considering the various plans for budget reform and legislative efficiency in the various states the Canadian plan of a single legislative house of forty or fifty members and a cabinet of a few department heads who prepare the budget, defend it and stay in office or go out as it is approved or amended, should be carefully considered.

Scientific budget systems are almost unknown in our states. Wisconsin has taken the greatest steps in this direction. Many other states have budget systems satisfactory to some degree, while still others have so little method in making appropriations and estimating the probable revenue that appropriations are often made which cannot be met with funds available. In this latter case, it is often left to the governor to cut down items deliberately made excessive by legislators—each member endeavoring to increase certain items and all forgetting the limit of expenditures. An example of what results is set forth in the Buffalo Courier of July 24, 1913, as follows:



"In Pennsylvania, members of the last legislature were aware that \$62,000,000 in revenue was all to be expected, yet they appropriated \$88,000,000 and left it to the governor to cut out \$26,000,000."

The Wisconsin State Board of Public Affairs, in "The Budget" prepared by S. Gale Lowrie, speaking of Nevada, says:

"During the year 1912 a special session of the legislature was necessary to reduce appropriations which had been made during the session of 1911 in excess of the estimated revenue of the state."

And of Montana:

"During the session of 1911 the appropriations by the legislature were in excess of the funds available for state purposes."

In Massachusetts, the reports from the various departments, commissions, etc., are made to the auditor, who makes up his report to the legislature. The Economy and Efficiency Commission and various legislative committees also submit reports to the legislature. All these reports are printed as house documents and furnish a wealth of complete, reliable, information upon which to base appropriations.

The Economy and Efficiency Commission is salaried, the chairman receiving \$5,000 a year. Their expenses for the year 1912 were limited to \$10,000. This commission examines statements submitted to it by the auditor; makes special examination of any matter affecting the management or finances of any department, institution, board, undertaking or commission, etc., and constantly studies the greater economy and efficiency in the business of the state.

Economy and efficiency surveys are now under way in the following states: Illinois, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, Iowa and South Dakota.

The essential weakness in the present Nebraska plan of public finance is this: The people who spend the public money (the heads of departments, commissions, bureaus and societies) have no connection with or responsibility for the people who appropriate the money (primarily the two houses of the legislature and more definitely the finance, ways and means committee). The reverse of this is likewise true: the two houses of the legislature have no connection with or responsibility for the departments which spend the money. State government in Nebraska and other American states is therefore squarely cut into two separate bodies (the spenders and the providers). Each spender naturally magnifies his office and function and tries to obtain more money for its use. If he fails with one legislature he, or his successor in office, tries the next. On the other hand, members of the legislature are in session but three months in the two years. Many of them are new members; most of them have no such acquaintance with the duties and needs of the different departments as will enable them to discriminate between real and pretended requirements. They have no time to discover where work is being duplicated and where unnecessary expense is made. Many of them, also, represent local institutions and dare not strike boldly at other items in the appropriation bills for fear it will react upon their own pet projects.

In foreign countries, in England, in Germany, in France, and other countries, in the provinces of Canada, a definite plan of how much money is to be spent and how it is to be raised must be worked out beforehand and presented to the legislature. The people who prepare it are responsible for the government when the legislature is not in session and must, in most cases, answer directly to the legislature in debate upon the need of each item of expense proposed and the justice of each tax which they propose to lay. The sanity and reason of such a plan compared with the lack of responsibility in our own American states are apparent to every man.

The statement which follows shows the manner in which appropriation bills are now prepared in the several states and has been freshly compiled from responses received for use in this bulletin. It must be borne in mind that while the theory of the law in a number of states calls for adequate information to the legislature as a basis for its appropriation bills, yet the practice,



partly due to the hurried nature of the legislative session and partly due to a number of other causes, is that no sifted information from a responsible officer charged with the duty of approving or rejecting the estimates of different departments ever reaches the present day American legislature:

#### BASIS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS.

**Alabama**—General appropriation bill prepared by auditor. General estimate presented to each legislature by governor, auditor and attorney general. Governor may veto specific items and also incorporate amendments. (Some permanent appropriations.)

**Arizona**—New law at last session requires auditor to establish a uniform system of accounting in all state departments and institutions. By law, heads of departments also required to prepare reports and estimates and submit them to governor, who transmits them to the legislature on first day of session.

**Arkansas**—Appropriation bills made up from reports of the state officers and of boards in charge of the educational and charitable institutions. For example, a joint committee visits the State University, confers with president and heads of departments and with help of president draws up a bill. (This bill may be changed by legislature.)

**California**—From budget prepared by State Board of Control and estimate of expenses by state controller. Not less than forty days before beginning of each regular session of the legislature the controller sends blank forms to head of each administrative department, board or commission, these blanks to be filled out and returned not less than fifteen days before beginning of legislative session.

**Colorado**—Governor required by law to make estimate of money necessary to raise by taxation for all purposes of the state. Governor has the power to compel statements from all departments, bureaus, etc., so he can make a detailed financial report to legislature. (Legislature not obliged to follow recommendations therein.) A report is also made the general assembly by governor and treasurer, heads of departments and institutions and a legislative committee appointed before beginning of session—all of whom visit institutions, etc.

**Connecticut**—Published estimate of state treasurer is used as a basis. Board of control has power to equalize appropriations made when it is apparent that there is a need in one department and an excess in another.

**Delaware**—One general appropriation bill for fiscal year. Appropriation bills drawn up by treasurer and two appropriation committees.

**Florida**—Appropriations based on reports from the departments and institutions with a view to future needs as compared with the past. Few permanent appropriations.

**Georgia**—Committee on appropriations makes estimate of needs after conference with heads of departments and anyone qualified to give information.

**Idaho**—Estimates from the various departments and institutions are submitted to governor and he refers them to the legislature. Appropriation committee, acting with investigating committee, prepares the appropriation bills.

**Illinois**—Each department sends estimate to appropriation committee. Visits are made to the various institutions and public hearings held and the committee finally submits a bill to the legislature.

**Indiana**—Departments and institutions make reports to the governor. Prior to convening of legislature a committee is selected by the governor to study estimates made and investigate needs. General appropriation bills made up from information thus obtained.

**Iowa**—Many appropriations are permanent. General appropriations based upon recommendation of appropriation committee after investigation of various departments and after due consideration of requests made.

**Kansas**—Auditor makes recommendations to legislature based upon reports made to him by the various departments and institutions. All appropriations must be renewed at each session of the legislature.

**Kentucky**—Appropriations are made by separate bills rather than by general appropriation bills. A committee does not prepare the bills—any member may do it.

**Louisiana**—Committee bases its bills upon public hearings and past needs of departments. General appropriation bills must be itemized and may contain only certain features—other appropriations are made by separate bills.

**Maine**—Heads of departments present estimates to auditor thirty days prior to opening of session. Auditor is in constant consultation with committee on appropriations. Open advertised hearings also held.

**Maryland**—Ways and means committee bases its estimate for appropriations upon information received from comptroller's office.

**Massachusetts**—Estimate of expenses of the various departments and commissions, together with explanation of any increase and citation to statutes, etc., are made by law to the state auditor, who submits them each year to the legislature. (These reports are printed as legislative documents.) Commission on Economy and Efficiency established in 1912. It is a salaried commission and sufficient funds are provided for making investigations when necessary—all with a view to the general economy and efficiency of the commonwealth.

**Michigan**—Each institution presents a bill for its individual appropriation and the auditor general prepares a blanket appropriation for other purposes. Hearings are held and visits made to the various institutions.

**Minnesota**—Each department submits estimate to committee on finance and appropriations. Hearings are held before the committee.

**Mississippi**—Each department makes report to legislature showing cost of maintenance. The finance or appropriation committee confers with the state auditor, treasurer and heads of institutions and bases appropriations on information thus obtained.

**Missouri**—Auditor secures information from different departments and then furnishes an estimate to the legislature. Hearings held before committees on appropriations.

**Montana**—State accountant under direction of board of examiners prepares estimate for committee on appropriations.

**Nebraska**—Report from each department of legislature. Finance or appropriation committee confers with auditor, treasurer and heads of institutions.

**Nevada**—Committee confers with comptroller, who helps estimate needs for the coming biennium.

**New Hampshire**—All appropriations are made by a budget bill. There are hearings before the committee. State auditor presents to the legislature estimate of expenses for ensuing biennium. Governor has no power of veto over items in budget.

**New Jersey**—Appropriation bills prepared by joint committee, who base their items upon information obtained from heads of departments and institution managers, filed with comptroller prior to session. Hearings sometimes held.

**New Mexico**—Appropriation or finance committee makes up bills based upon information received from heads of departments and institutions.

**New York**—A State Department of Efficiency and Economy. Governor appoints a commissioner, salary \$12,000 per annum. Powers and duties: To study state departments and institutions, examine methods of accounting; power to take testimony. Institutions and departments must file statements of desired appropriations with commissioner. Commissioner to make recommendations based on information and investigation.



State Board of Estimates, composed of nine members, meets on or before January 1 annually to prepare estimates for a budget of amounts to be appropriated by legislature; examine requests for appropriations and transmits estimate to legislature. Boards, institutions and departments file with this budget commission estimates of desired appropriations thirty to sixty days before beginning of fiscal year. Estimate revenues to be expected from state.

**North Carolina**—Various departments and institutions submit reports to the legislature. Treasurer furnishes legislature with estimate of expenses for next two years and rate of taxation necessary to pay the same.

**North Dakota**—Various state institutions make reports of desired appropriations to the state auditor before December 10 of each legislative year. Auditor tabulates these reports and presents them to the legislature, together with a statement showing estimated revenue from which appropriations can be made. Consideration of appropriation bills rests with joint finance committee. Report of this committee usually adopted by both houses.

**Ohio**—Departments submit to the auditor estimates of their needs for each biennium and a compilation of these requests is made by the auditor. The committee which prepares appropriation bills calls in the heads of various departments for a discussion of the items. Some institutions are visited by junket committees. (Act of 1913 provides that the governor submit to the general assembly estimates of the departmental heads for the ensuing biennium. These estimates are to be based upon data submitted by the departments. The governor is empowered to employ persons to examine the affairs of the different departments and recommend more efficient and economical methods of conducting their affairs.)

**Oklahoma**—Each department is called upon to make an estimate; lobbying is then carried on by each department with the appropriations committees and members generally.

**Oregon**—Secretary of state presents a budget to the legislature. Hereafter the new board of control will present statement of institutional needs.

**Pennsylvania**—Budget from each department submitted to committee on appropriations.

**Rhode Island**—Treasurer's estimate and private hearings assist the committee in making up appropriation bills.

**South Carolina**—Controller presents a statement to the legislature based upon reports of county auditors, heads of departments and institutions.

**South Dakota**—Each department gets as much as possible from appropriation committee. Bills are made up from representation of various departments.

**Texas**—Appropriations committee uses report of comptroller based upon information furnished by heads of departments and institutions; also personal evidence, inspection of institutions, etc.

**Utah**—State auditor makes a report for the biennial period to the legislature.

**Vermont**—Various state departments furnish information which enables ways and means committee to make a report to the legislature.

**Virginia**—Known expenses of departments and institutions, estimates presented to committees and conference with auditor and other officials enable the finance committee to report to the legislature.

**Washington**—Budget from different departments is placed in hands of appropriation committee.

**West Virginia**—State Board of Control presents estimates for various institutions, and heads of departments present estimates for their departments.

**Wisconsin**—Every public body involving receipt or expenditure of any state money submits to the board of public affairs an estimate of its revenues and expenditures for each fiscal year of the ensuing biennial period. (Board of

Public Affairs consists of governor, secretary of state, chairmen of house and senate finance committees.)

**Wyoming**—Each office makes a report to the auditor before beginning of session setting forth its needs for the next two years. State treasurer submits to legislature estimate of expenses for use in making up appropriation bills.

#### COST OF LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS.

A financial budget exhibiting a complete statement of a state's resources and expenditures for the period covered by legislative appropriations will include the expenses of the legislature itself. Probably in no department of public expense is there more lack of systematic planning and economic expenditure than in the expenses of the legislature itself. This arises in part from the fact that every session of the legislature votes the money for its own expenses, and disburses generally through its own officers, who change from session to session. There is, therefore, no continuous plan of what shall be done by a legislature and how much shall be spent. Further, the fact that one legislature spends more money than another is by no means a sign that it is more extravagant or less efficient. Oftentimes it becomes the duty of a legislature to do important, special work in the interest of the whole people. Sometimes this takes the form of extensive investigations, costing much public money, but necessary for the public welfare. Conditions, also, vary widely in the different states. The pay of members is much larger in some states than others. The length of sessions must also vary, depending upon the local situation. For these and many other reasons, a mere comparison of figures of legislative expenses in the several states does not demonstrate the relative efficiency and economy of legislatures. However, a comparative table of legislative expenses classified under various heads furnishes valuable critical material for the problems arising in each separate state. Such a table has therefore been compiled for this bulletin.



TABLE SHOWING EXPENSES OF LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS IN THE SEVERAL STATES.

State	Session	Pay and Mileage of Members	Per Diem of Members or Salary per Annum while in Session	Pay of Officers and Employees	Cost of Printing Legis- lative Bills	Other Miscellaneous Expenses	Total Legislative Expenses of All Kinds	Total Days in Ses- sion
Alabama	Session of 1911	\$57,071.00 173.30	\$4 per diem	\$44,720.00		\$13,903.83	\$115,868.13, not incl. printing.	95
Arizona			7 per diem					
Arkansas			6 per diem					
California	Jan. 6 to Feb. 4, 1913, and Mar. 10 to May 12, 1913	131,164.40	1,000 per term	94,000.00	\$95,566.96	27,015.13	347,746.49	94
Colorado *								
Connecticut	Jan. 1 to April 15, 1913	100,814.48	1,000 per term	37,183.00	25,380.51	13,555.67	176,933.66	
Delaware	Jan. 8 to June 4, 1913	94,236.00	300 per ann.	29,379.14	31,952.91	18,270.37	173,838.42	68
Florida			5 per diem					
Georgia	June 25 to Aug. 13, 1913	52,601.70	6 per diem	13,523.60	700.00	275.00	67,100.30	50
Idaho	Jan. 6 to March 6, 1913	31,778.50	4.50 per diem	17,124.77	4,895.15	8,201.58	62,000.00	60
Illinois	Jan. 8 to June 30, 1913	430,674.30	5 per diem	95,353.50	58,492.02	106,539.48	691,059.30	
Indiana	Session of 1913		2,000 per ann.				169,000.00	61
Iowa	Jan. 13 to Apr. 19, 1913	160,662.05	6 per diem	\$2.50 to 5.00 per day 57,614.57	22,048.17	5,546.31	245,871.10	96
Kansas	Jan. 14 to Mar. 17, 1913	38,578.60 Includes postage.	3 per diem	35,954.00	Entire cost of printing and binding bills, stationery and sun- dries. 2,942.98 \$1,002.91 for calendars of two houses; \$144.42 for enrolled bills; \$512.10 for publication of bills in state papers. \$10,000.00 for bills, res- olutions, acts and journals.	3,930.62 4,041.00	85,447.20	63
Kentucky †	Jan. 6, to Mar. 17, 1914	\$10.00 per diem, 15c per mile for one round trip.					125,000.00	
Louisiana			5 per diem					
Maine			300 per ann.					
Maryland	Session of 1912	72,524.60	5 per diem	100,075.17	17,337.00	9,890.83	199,827.60	90
Massachusetts	Jan. 1 to June 20, 1913	302,001.05	1,000 per ann.	58,968.06	56,950.37	43,168.56	461,088.04	119
Michigan	Jan. 1 to May 15, 1913	109,565.40	800 per ann.	\$45,131.00 salaries 2,781.10 mileage	36,821.10	15,520.72	209,819.32	135
Minnesota	Jan. 7 to April 24, 1913	188,832.95	1,000 per ann.	75,113.50	Includes indexing jour- nals. 19,209.39	5,264.30	288,420.14	81



Mississippi	Session of 1912	96,607.65	500 per session				17,467.44	114,075.09	
Missouri	Jan. 8 to Mar. 24, 1913	Pay and mileage of members and pay of officers, \$81,441.00.	3 per diem		28,971.09		Other expenses, except printing. 168,952.80 Includes clerical force.	Not including printing.	76
Montana	Jan. 4 to Mar. 4, 1913	75,000.00	10 per diem	45,371.00			10,000.00	130,371.00	60
Nebraska	Jan. 7 to April 21, 1913	84,350.30	600 per term	51,863.00			13,013.15	159,482.21	74
Nevada	Jan. 20 to Mar. 20, 1913	50,531.00	10 per diem	16,809.85			2,826.77	70,167.72	60
New Hampshire								Not including printing which is done at state printing offices.	
New Jersey	January to March, 1913	40,333.32	200 per ann.	47,250.00			1,458.11	94,241.43	
New Mexico	Jan. 14 to Mar. 14, 1913	25,906.30	500 per ann.	13,440.00			2,635.19	45,566.43	60
New York		309,628.99	5 per diem	250,422.80			343,809.84	2,376,194.52	
			1,500 per ann.				Including \$24,-	This does not	
North Carolina			4 per diem				602.38, cost of	include \$72,-	
North Dakota	Jan 7 to March 7, 1913	56,256.70	5 per diem	28,219.20			bill drafting	842.21 for	60
Ohio	Jan. 6 to April 28, 1913	200,000.00	1,000 per ann.	See miscellaneous expenses.			department.	special com-	62
		Appropriated.						missions, etc.	
Oklahoma									
Oregon	Jan. 9 to Feb. 18, 1911	14,423.90	6 per diem	29,556.96			11,713.21	111,039.94	
Pennsylvania			3 per diem				58,083.81	263,883.81	
Rhode Island			1,500 per sess'n				All other ex-		
South Carolina	Jan 14 to Feb. 28, 1913	55,437.73	5 per diem	6,712.00			penses, includ-		
South Dakota	Jan. 7 to Mar. 7, 1913	46,902.50	200 per ann.	15,659.20			ing employees.		
			5 per diem						40
							11,009.10	67,064.46	
Tennessee	58th regular session	50,819.07	4 per diem	See miscellaneous expenses.					
							670.00	62,814.73	40
							14,865.51	98,063.03	60
							Includes cost of printing and binding daily journal.		
							58,006.40	Amounts only	
							Approximate.	approximate.	

\* Publishing initiated and referred bills and constitutional amendments, \$115,355.84—in addition. + Estimates for session 1914.

† Includes sundry miscellaneous printing expenses.

‡ This amount does not include cost of printing House and Senate Journals, Session Laws, letter-heads, envelopes and other miscellaneous printing.

TABLE SHOWING EXPENSES OF LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS IN THE SEVERAL STATES—Concluded.

State	Session	Pay and Mileage of Members	Per Diem of Members or Salary per Annum while in Session	Pay of Officers and Employees	Cost of Printing Legis- lative Bills	Other Miscellaneous Expenses	Total Legislative Expenses of All Kinds	Total Days in Ses- sion
Texas	Jan. 14 to April 1, 1913	Mileage and per diem of members, officers and employes, \$120,- 150.00. Per diem of members \$5 a day for first 60 days, and after that \$2. Mile- age about \$15,000 \$16,409.40.				\$35,000.00	\$155,150.00	
Utah	Jan 13 to Mar 13, 1911		\$4 per diem.....	\$12,870.50	\$10,966.89 Includes laws. 4,887.76	5,422.73	45,669.52	60
Vermont	Oct. 8, 1912, to Feb. 22, 1913	152,039.15	4 per diem.....	34,389.40	12,714.81	4,563.67	195,879.98	119
Virginia	Session of 1912	74,931.40	500 per sess'n	19,514.00 Includes mileage.	14,128.28	14,450.66	121,610.87	
Washington	Jan. 12 to Mar. 13, 1913	47,916.67	5 per diem.....	33,876.25	Estimated at 15,000.00	6,220.04	102,141.24	60
West Virginia		25,351.10	4 per diem.....	26,649.00	Includes acts, 42,099.42*	15,178.79	82,178.89	45
Wisconsin	Jan. 8 to Aug. 9, 1913	71,621.24	500 per ann.....	76,918.42	Includes session laws. 3,509.85	4,148.15	194,787.23	
Wyoming	Jan. 14 to Feb. 22, 1913	39,383.10	8 per diem.....			3,460.00	45,352.95	40

\* In addition to this sum Wisconsin paid \$49,900 for publication of the laws of 1913 in the weekly newspapers. These newspapers received \$100 each.